

BIG PICTURE POLICIES

List No. 1

Management and Financing Approaches
<p>(A) Creation of Water and Wastewater Utilities Oversight Board(s) – Consider creation of a single (or separate) citizen <u>board to provide policy direction and management oversight</u> to the City’s Water and Wastewater Utility Systems. Members would likely be appointed by the Mayor with approval by the City Council.</p>
<p>(B) Utilization of Special Assessment Districts – Examine the potential broader application of the “special assessment district” concept to construct various infrastructure elements</p>
<p>(C) “Executive Orders” (EO) vs. Special Assessment District Cost – Examine why there are apparent differences in costs between the use of the “Executive Order (EO)” vs. “Special Assessment District” approach.</p>
<p>(D) Creation of Park Districts – Consider creation of “park districts” to fund and construct neighborhood parks.</p>
Comprehensive Plan and Long Range Infrastructure Planning
<p>(E) Consistency and Continuity of Comprehensive Plan Implementation – Savings could be achieved if the <u>City commits to following the infrastructure program</u> shown in the Comprehensive Plan. Indiscriminate and/or frequent departures from the Plan’s infrastructure program discourages and undermines long term facilities planning and reduces the cost savings such planning can provide.</p>
<p>(F) Prioritize City’s CIP Projects Relative to Adopted Comprehensive Plan – Institute policies and procedures for closely <u>tying the programming of capital projects (i.e., CIP) with the growth phasing program</u> and related policies in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
<p>(G) Moderate Phased Development Called for in Adopted Comprehensive Plan – Cost savings could be achieved if the infrastructure improvements called for in the Plan are <u>phased in development over longer period of time</u>.</p>
<p>(H) Policies Governing Infrastructure Projects Not in Conformance with Comprehensive Plan – The City should have clear policies concerning development requests that are <u>not in conformance with the adopted Comprehensive Plan</u> – for example, projects falling outside of the Future Urban Service Area requiring installation of capital infrastructure not programmed in the Comprehensive Plan.</p>

Infrastructure in Existing Urban Areas
(I) Infrastructure Maintenance in Existing Neighborhoods – Examine options for increasing the efficient delivery of maintenance services to older areas of the community without adversely affecting the long term quality of the infrastructure or services to these areas.
Wastewater Service Delivery Policy
(J) Gravity Flow vs. Force Main/Lift Station Policy for Wastewater – <u>Gravity flow</u> wastewater mains are the primary collection technique used by the City’s sanitary sewer system. <u>Forced main systems and lift stations</u> are typically discouraged. The approach would result in giving greater consideration to the broader application of forced main system and lift stations throughout the City’s wastewater system.
Supplemental Items
(K) Assessment Districts for Rehabilitation/Reconstruction Projects – Where arterial streets, sewers, or water lines have served their useful life and are worn out, it is rational and fair to assess the properties which benefit from the rehabilitation/reconstruction of those facilities for the benefits thereby conferred.
(L) Creation of a Street Construction Fund Oversight Board – Consider creation of a citizen board to provide policy direction and management oversight to the City’s street construction.

I:\MIFC\cost savings work group\Matrix_Big_Picture_Items_Listing.wpd

SYSTEM AND PROCESSES

List No. 2

Bidding and Contracting Procedures
(A) “Design-Build” Bidding Approach – Seek State legislative authorization and a City Charter amendment to allow the City to enter into a <u>single contract for the design and construction</u> of a facility (e.g., large-scale roadways, water transmission mains, wastewater collection mains.) This approach would presumably only be used when it was felt that significant cost and/or monetary savings could be achieved.
(B) “Indefinite Delivery Contract” Approach – Such contracts <u>contain general terms</u> (i.e., a generic description of what sort of work is to be done), <u>along with a fee schedule</u> (i.e., how much the City would pay for a given “unit” of work.) These contracts could be written for construction projects or professional services. This approach allows the City to retain firms on an on-going basis and only utilize their services as the need arises. This could provide saving in procurement time and possibly service delivery.
(C) Aggregate Construction Projects in a Single Bid – <u>Lump several construction projects</u> (perhaps covering a two year period) <u>into a single contract</u> to encourage efficiencies from the economies of scale that such a method may provide.
Public Right-of-Way Acquisition
(D) Advanced Acquisition of Right of Way (ROW) Along Arterial Corridors – Public ROW is used to move traffic, provide overhead and underground corridors for utilities, support trails and pedestrian ways, and offer an area for installing street trees and other plant materials providing buffers to adjacent land uses. The acquisition of ROW is often a major cost for roadway and utility projects, and its acquisition can be a very time consumption process. What procedural options are available for speeding the ROW acquisition process and for securing ROW well <u>in advance of development</u> in order to reduce project costs and construction time?
(E) Right-of-Way Acquisition Policy – Present City policies to <u>acquire ROW for a soon-to-be-built project</u> prescribe a very involved multi-step process. There are many activities that must be completed before the ROW can be purchased or condemned by the City. Review of these policies may highlight changes the could shorten the time needed to acquire the ROW, thus saving time and potentially public funds.
(F) Increase City’s Right-of-Way Acquisition Staff and Resources – The assignment of <u>additional staff and resources</u> toward acquiring ROW could lead to the speedier construction of infrastructure improvements.

Miscellaneous Systems and Procedures
(G) Platting Procedure Efficiencies – Are there any time efficiencies that could be gained from a revamping of the City’s <u>platting process</u> and standards?
(H) “Pro Rata Ordinance” Policy – Clarify and formalize the City’s “over-sizing standards” and methods for collecting fees from future developments.
(I) City Inspection Program – Consider <u>using City’s current inspection program in a more assertive fashion</u> to ensure that infrastructure improvements are installed by private contractors in the most timely and quality fashion possible.
(J) Expand Use of City Grant Writing Program to Secure Additional Capital Funds – Seek <u>greater use of City’s grant writing program</u> to seek all reasonably available State and Federal grant monies for infrastructure projects.
(K) Inter-Agency Communication and Coordination – Examine ways for <u>enhancing the communication and coordination</u> of capital projects between Public Works and Utilities, LES, LPS, Parks and Recreation, other utilities, and other city and county agencies.
Supplemental Items
(L) Put More Responsibility for Construction Drawings, etc., on Private Engineers – The system now provides for a “first in, first out” approach. This results in incomplete drawings being given the same status as complete drawings. Incomplete drawings take more city time to review and slows up the process by weeks or months. Private engineers should be held responsible for their products. Complete products should be given priority over incomplete products.

I:\MIFC\cost savings work group\Matrix_Systems_and_Processes_Items_Listing.wpd

INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENTS

List No. 3

Water
<p>(A) Size of Major Water Distribution Mains Within the Urban Area – Review assumptions used by the Public Utilities Department (i.e., geographic area to be served by a specific distribution main, land uses to be served by the main, assumed flow capacity. etc.) in calculating the <u>preferred size of future water distribution mains</u>.</p>
<p>(B) Pipe Materials for Distribution Mains in Urban Areas – Review assumptions used by the Public Utilities Department in selecting the <u>materials used for the City’s water distribution mains</u>.</p>
Wastewater (Sanitary Sewer)
<p>(C) Size of Major Wastewater Collection Mains Within the Urban Area - Review assumptions used by the Public Utilities Department (i.e., geographic area to be served by a specific main, land uses to be served, assumed flow capacity, etc.) in calculating the <u>preferred size of future wastewater collection mains</u>.</p>
<p>(D) Pipe Materials for Collection Mains in Urban Area – Review assumptions used by the Public Utilities Department in selected the <u>materials for making the City’s wastewater collection mains</u>.</p>
<p>(E) Single Mains vs. Parallel Mains – Review assumptions concerning the initial <u>construction of a larger single wastewater collection main</u> for a given drainage basin, <i>versus</i> <u>construction of separate smaller parallel collection mains</u> over a period of time.</p>
Streets, Roads, and Highways
<p>(F) Material and Construction Standards for Streets – The City has adopted <u>material and construction standards for city streets</u> (e.g., thickness of materials, base materials, construction techniques.) Is there merit in reviewing these standards for possible revisions?</p>
<p>(G) Width of Driving and Turning Lanes – City policy calls for travel and turn lanes to be 12 ft. in width for newer arterials. Should this <u>lane width standard be reduced</u> to save on construction costs?</p>

(H) Duel Left Turn Lanes on Future Arterials – The City has assumed the need for dual left turn lanes on future arterial streets within the future urban growth areas. Should this assumption be retained, reduced in scope, or eliminated as the basis for reducing project costs?

(I) Striping Policies – The City has standards for how and how often to stripe travel lanes, turn lanes, and pedestrian crossings. Based on these standards and available resources, the City seems to be falling behind in keeping these facilities current in the older areas of the city. How can this growing maintenance need be addressed?

(J) Costs for Retaining Wall – With the use of the 120 foot right-of-way standard for future arterial streets, will the need for retaining walls along arterials be decreased? If so, should the City’s cost estimates for future retaining walls be modified (i.e., lowered or eliminated?)

(K) Traffic and Pedestrian Signal Assumptions – The City has assumed approximately 3.5 traffic signals and 1 pedestrian signal per mile along future arterials. Using a lower ratio of signals per mile of arterial could result in lower costs – estimated by one Work Group member as \$212,500 per mile for traffic signals and \$40,000 per mile for pedestrian signals.

Management and Finance

(L) Developer Contributions to Arterial Street Projects – City policy may require developers to contribute one-half of the cost associated with a “Two-through-lane-and-a-single-center-turn-lane facility.” How are these conditions being accounted for in the City’s projection of future costs? How might the adoption of impact fee ordinance affect this “policy?”

(M) Sureties for Sidewalks and Street Trees Along Arterial – Developers currently post sureties guaranteeing the installation of sidewalks and street trees along arterials adjacent to their developments. Is this still necessary? How are such costs accounted for in the projected arterial street cost estimates?

(N) Costs for Burying LES Lines – Existing overhead “LES lines” are often buried as part of roadway construction projects. Who pays for this? Is LES contributing to the cost of upgrading or adding capacity when this situation occurs?

(O) Reimbursement of LES Costs – PW&U has indicated that some “LES project costs” are initially paid for out of PW&U project budgets; which are then reimbursed by LES; and in turn, LES is then reimbursed by City general funds. Should this policy remain in place? How are these costs included in the projection of future project costs” by PW&U?

Road Construction Sequencing
<p>(P) Building Urban Streets as a Final Cross Section – Should the City proceed with a policy that would call for constructing arterial streets as they might be needed at final design? That is, as a rural road is brought into the City and is upgraded to an urban-style arterial street, <u>should the street be built as it may be needed once greater urbanization occurs (for example, built initially as a four lane section)?</u> or should it be first constructed as a two lane urban facility and expanded at a later date to a four lane section?</p>
<p>(Q) Construction Phasing for Urban Cross Sections – Should the construction of urban arterials be phased so that they are <u>built “from the outside (lanes) inward?”</u> This would allow for stormwater utilities and other utilities to be put in place at the time of initial roadway construction and not later relocated.</p>
Supplemental Items
<p>(R) Work with the County to Establish Future Grade for Section Line Arterials (or at Least Estimate Them Within a Couple of Feet) – Establishing these grades prior to subdivisions developing along them will reduce the need for future grading and minimize the need for such added features as retaining walls.</p>
<p>(S) Plan to Use Existing Paved County Roads in Newly Annexed Areas of the City – Some county roads are virtually brand new when the City annexes the area served by the roads. These roads should be used for a period of time to reduce the immediate strain on the street construction budget. It is reasonable to get the greatest use possible out of the public dollars spent to construct these roads, especially since 90 percent of County tax payers reside within the City.</p>

I:\MIFC\cost savings work group\Matrix_Infrastructure_Element_Items_Listing.wpd